

REMARKS

In the October 21, 2004 Office Action, all of the claims 1-23 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections are made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the October 21, 2004 Office Action, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. However, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 8, 13, and 19-20 to define the scope of the invention even more clearly. Thus, claims 1-23 are pending, with claims 1 and 13 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

Drawings

Applicant has found a typographical error in Figure 10 upon review of the drawings. More specifically, the reference number for the housing unit was incorrectly typed as "10," where it should have been "110." Accordingly, Applicant wishes to amend Figure 10 to correct the typographical error. Applicant believes that the drawings comply with 37 CFR §1.83(a) after this amendment to Figure 10. Approval of the amendment to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Specification

Applicant has found typographical errors in the specification as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the specification as presented above. Applicant believes that the specification is now correct and complies with 37 CFR §1.71 and §1.75(d)(1).

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-14, 18-20, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0146325 to Kitajima ("Kitajima patent"). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 1 and 13

Applicant believes that the Kitajima patent does not disclose or suggest the first and second lids required by claims 1 and 13 of the present application. The Office Action asserts that the casing 2a and the lid portion 2b of the Kitajima patent respectively correspond to the second and first lids of claims 1 and 13, and the protective cover 38 corresponds to the cover member of claims 1 and 13. However, claims 1 and 13 further require that the first lid have a

first cut-out portion that is covered by the cover member when the first lid is coupled to the housing unit. Furthermore, as stated in claims 1 and 13 as now amended, the first cut-out portion partially exposes the housing unit in a direction parallel to the master gear shaft. However, as seen in Figures 3 and 4, the lid member 2b of the Kitajima patent does *not* have a first cut-out portion that partially exposes the housing unit in a direction parallel to the master gear shaft. Therefore, the cover 38 cannot cover the first cut-out portion when the lid member 2b is attached to the housing unit as required by claims 1 and 13, since *there is no exposure to cover between the lid member 2b and the casing 2a in the direction parallel to the master gear shaft.*

Furthermore, claims 1 and 13 of the present application require that the first and second lids be coupled to the housing unit *detachably/reattachably*. As clearly seen from Figures 3 and 4 of the Kitajima patent, the casing 2a, the housing unit, and the rod attachment portion are formed integrally as a one-piece member. Therefore, the casing 2a *cannot* be detached from the housing unit. In other words, the reel of the Kitajima patent has only one lid, not two lids as required by claims 1 and 13. This is clearly contrary to the requirements of claims 1 and 13 as originally filed.

It is well settled under the U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 13, as originally filed and as currently amended, are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 6

Similarly, Applicant believes that the Kitajima patent does not disclose or suggest the first and second lids required by claim 6 of the present application. The Office Action asserts that the casing 2a and the lid portion 2b of the Kitajima patent respectively correspond to the second and first lids of claim 6, and the protective cover 38 corresponds to the cover member of claim 6. However, claim 6 of the present application requires that the first lid have a first cut-out portion that is covered by the cover member when the first lid is coupled to the housing unit, and that the second lid have a second cut-out portion that is covered by the cover member. Furthermore, as stated in claim 6 as now amended, the first cut-out portion partially exposes the housing unit in the direction parallel to the master gear shaft, and the second cut-out portion partially exposes the housing unit in the direction parallel to the

master gear shaft. However, as seen in Figures 3 and 4, the lid member 2b does not have a first cut-out portion that partially exposes the housing unit in the direction parallel to the master gear shaft. Therefore, the cover 38 cannot cover the first cut-out portion and when the lid member 2b is attached to the casing 2a, since ***there is no exposure to cover between the lid member 2b and the casing 2a in the direction parallel to the master gear shaft.*** Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6, as originally filed and currently amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2, 7-8, 10-12, 14, 18-20, 22, and 23 are also allowable over the prior art of record because they depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 13, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate independent claims 1, 6, and 13, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 3-5 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kitajima patent. Claims 9 and 21 further stand rejected as being unpatentable over the Kitajima patent in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0056776 to Sugawara (“Sugawara patent”). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

As discussed above, the Kitajima patent does not disclose or suggest the first cut-out portion of claims 1, 6, and 13 as originally filed.

Regarding the Sugawara patent, it has been cited in the Office Action to show the rod attachment portion that is formed integrally with the housing unit. The Sugawara patent clearly does not show or disclose the first cut-out portion required by claims 1, 6, and 13. As shown in Figure 3 of the Sugawara patent, the lid member 2d does not have a first cut-out portion that partially exposes the housing unit in the direction parallel to the master gear shaft. Thus, the cover 13 of the Sugawara patent cannot cover the first cut-out portion when the lid member 2d is attached to the reel body 2a, since ***there is no exposure to cover between the lid member 2d and the reel body 2a in the direction parallel to the master gear shaft.***

Therefore, the Sugawara patent does not show or suggest the arrangement of claims 1, 6, and 13, whether taken singularly or in combination with the Kitajima patent.

Therefore, Applicant believes that dependent claims 3-5, 9, 15-17, and 21 are also allowable over the prior art of record because they depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 13, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 6, and 13, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references are made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-23 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Kiyoe K. Kabashima
Reg. No. 54,874

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444

Dated: Jan 21, 2005

Appl. No. 10/764,588
Amendment dated January 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 21, 2004

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to Figure 10. This sheet of Figure 10 replaces the original sheet of Figure 10.

Attachment: one (1) replacement sheet